

IV. REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1, 7, 13 and 14 have been amended. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicants reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Shear (US patent no 5,627,972), hereafter "Shear." Applicants assert that Shear does not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention. For example, with respect to independent claims 1, 7, 13 and 14, Applicants submit that Shear fails to teach or suggest representative samples of messages stored in said message log. One of the stated goals of the invention in Shear is "...to provide a data interchange system, adapted to receive a message having first data format, to receivably store the first message, and to translate the received message into a second data structure or format, at a predefined time later." Col. 2, lines 28-32. In accordance with its goal, Shear includes "...an archiving system, which allows for the selective storing of message." Col. 4, lines 6-7. This archiving system in Shear does not store representative samples of messages to be used in later statistical analysis to translate a new message, but rather stores selective messages, which will be translated at a predefined time. In contrast, the present invention includes "...representative samples of messages stored in said message log." Claim 1. As such, the message log of the present invention is not used to store a selected message for later translation as in Shear, but rather stores representative samples of

messages, which are later used to translate a new incoming message. Thus, the message log as claimed in the present invention is not equivalent to the archiving system in Shear. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw its rejection.

With further respect to independent claims 1, 7, 13 and 14, Applicants respectfully submit that Shear also fails to teach or suggest a statistical analysis. During the transformation process, the Shear system may increment a counter each time a data object is recognized in the message to be transformed. Col. 6, lines 30-40. However, this Shear component is simply a counter and does not analyse message field values. Furthermore, as stated above, Shear does not use its archiving system in incrementing the counter, but only to selectively store messages for later translation. Col. 2, lines 28-32; col. 4, lines 6-7. The present invention, in contrast, includes "...analysing the message fields in the representative samples of messages stored in said message log to get a statistical analysis of the values of the message fields." Claim 1. The statistical analysis as claimed in the current invention includes an analysis of the values of the message fields, rather than simply being a counter that is incremented if there is a match as in Shear. Furthermore, unlike the archiving system in Shear that is only used to selectively store a message for future transformation, the representative samples of messages stored in the message log of the present invention are analysed to get a statistical analysis of the values of the message fields. For the above reasons, the incremented counter in Shear is not equivalent to the statistical analysis as claimed in the present invention. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

With still further respect to independent claims 1, 7, 13 and 14, Applicants respectfully submit that Shear also fails to teach or suggest responsive to said compatibility determination and

said statistical analysis to select the best fit output message field into which to transform a given input message field. The data interchange system in Shear transforms a message in the format of a first computer system to that of a second computer system. Col. 3, lines 45-50. To accomplish this task, Shear uses a number of databases to store the information that is then used to transform the message. Col. 4, lines 15-29. This information "...consists of or includes user defined references which define access to the transformed or related data." Col. 4, lines 22-23. No statistical analysis of representative message samples is used in the Shear transformation process. In contrast, the current invention includes "...responsive to said compatibility determination and said statistical analysis to select the best fit output message field into which to transform a given input message field." Claim 1. The transformation as included in the current invention does not simply use a database of user defined references as in Shear, but rather uses factors including statistical analysis to select the best output message field into which to transform a given input message field. As stated above, this statistical analysis is arrived at through analysis of the message fields in the representative samples of messages stored in the message log. Thus, the transformation in Shear using user defined references is not equivalent to the selection of the best fit output message field using factors that include statistical analysis as included in the present invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw its rejection.


With respect to dependent claims, Applicants herein incorporate the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claims from which the dependent claims depend. Furthermore, Applicants submit that all dependant claims are allowable based on their own distinct features. Since the cited art does not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

V. CONCLUSION

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 9, 2004



Ronald A. D'Alessandro
Reg. No.: 42,456

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
Three E-Comm Square
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)